

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1, 4, 5, 8-13, 16, 17, 20-25, 28, 29, 32-36 and 44-52 were pending and rejected. In this response, no claims have been canceled. Claims 1, 8, 13, 20, 25, 32, and 45 have been amended to particularly point out and distinctly claim, in full, clear, concise, and exact terms, the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 4-5, 8-11, 13, 16-17, 20-23, 25, 28-29, 32-35 and 44-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,448,979 to Schena et al. (“Schena”), in view of “The Origami Project: Paper Interfaces to the World-Wide Web”, by Robinson, et al. (“Robinson”). In view of the foregoing amendments, it is respectfully submitted that the present invention as claimed includes limitations that are not disclosed or suggested by Schena and Robinson, individually or in combination.

Specifically, for example, independent claim 1 as amended recites as follows:

- 1, A method comprising:
 creating a multimedia annotation for a paper document, the multimedia annotation representing at least one of an audio sound and a video clip;
 and
 creating a first multimedia document by combining the paper document and the multimedia annotation represented by a first bar code encoding the at least one of the audio sound and video clip,
 wherein the first multimedia document is generated as a part of reproducing the paper document via a document reproduction system, wherein the multimedia annotation is captured via an input device of the document reproduction system while the paper document is being reproduced via the document reproduction system, wherein the captured multimedia annotation is encoded within the first bar code, and
 wherein the first multimedia document, which when scanned by a process, the process causes the printed multimedia annotation to be decoded, the at least one of the audio sound and video clip to be extracted from the multimedia annotation, and the at least one extracted audio sound and video clip can be played via a multimedia player. (Emphasis added)

Thus, independent claim 1 as amended includes encoding at least one of the audio sound and video clip in a bar code which can be printed on a multimedia document, when the multimedia document is generated by a document reproduction system such as a scanner or a copier by reproducing a paper document. The multimedia document having the bar code encoding the audio sound and/or video clip can be subsequently scanned and the bar code is decoded to extract the audio sound and/or video clip. The extracted audio sound and video clip can be played by a multimedia player.

In addition, the multimedia annotation having at least one of the audio sound and video clip is captured via an input device of the document reproduction system such as a microphone for audio and a camera for video. The captured multimedia annotation is then encoded and embedded within the bar code, which can be extracted subsequently from the bar code and played by a media player. It is respectfully submitted that these limitations are absent from the cited references.

Rather, instead of creating a multimedia document by combining a paper document with a multimedia annotation, Schena discusses extracting a machine readable code from an existing printed medium, where the machine readable code contains a URL to access a remote location to retrieve provider information (see, Abstract of Schena). There is no mention or suggestion within Schena of creating a multimedia document by combining a paper document with a multimedia annotation, particularly, as a part of reproducing the paper document via a document reproduction system, such as, for example, a copy machine.

In addition, Schena fails to disclose or suggest that the machine-readable code of the printed medium represents at least one of an audio clip and a video clip via a bar code that encodes the audio and/or video clips. That is, the audio sound and/or video clip are encoded within the bar code on within the document. Rather, the machine-readable code of Schena

contains a URL link to a remote location from which the provider information can be downloaded (see, col. 2, lines 8-25 of Schena). Therefore, the machine-readable code of Schena does not encode at least one of an audio sound and a video clip. Further, there is no disclosure or suggestion within Schena that the machine-readable code is in a form of a bar code.

The Office Action contended that the link information disclosed by Schena reads on the multimedia annotation because Applicant's specification states that a multimedia annotation could be "a bar code containing an audio message or a URL indicating a link to a video clip" (see, e.g., 1/22/2007 Office Action, p. 4). The Office Action was correct by quoting the specific section of Applicant's specification. However, the quoted section of the Applicant's specification clearly states that the multimedia annotation may be a bar code "containing" an audio message, which is clearly not in a form of linkage, and the claimed language clearly indicates such a limitation.

In addition, even if, for the sake of argument, the link information of Schena might be interpreted to read on the multimedia annotation as claimed in claim 1, the cited references, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the limitation in which the multimedia annotation is captured via an input device of the document reproduction system while the paper document is being reproduced via the document reproduction system, where the captured multimedia annotation is encoded within the first bar code.

Although Schena discloses an input device of a computing device having a voice interactive command interface as contented by the Office Action (see, e.g., 1/22/2007 Office Action, pp. 13-14), such an input device of Schena is not used to capture the multimedia annotation. In other words, the captured content is not encoded or embedded as a multimedia annotation within a bar code. There is no support or disclosure within Schena that the

computing device has such a capability to encode the content captured from an input device in a bar code.

Rather, the captured content from an input device of Schena includes an interactive voice command that is transmitted to a portal server. The portal server in turn interprets the interactive voice command and sends the requested multimedia content back to the user.

Specifically, Schena states:

The user interface obtains user input information, such as an advertising authorization, a transaction authorization, user personal profile information, and user interest information corresponding to the provider information. The user input information may be received and stored by either the scanner, the receiver, or the portal server. The scanner routes the link information and the user input information based upon a user request via the user interface. The user interface may be, for example, a voice-activated system, a keypad, or a keyboard. In one embodiment, the user interface may reside on any one or more of the scanner, the receiver, such as customer premises equipment for displaying the multimedia sequence information, or the portal server.

...

The portal server is capable of receiving the link information and the user input information, selecting a multimedia information sequence corresponding to the link information and the user input information, and sending the multimedia information sequence via the network to the receiver.

(Schena, col. 2, lines 26-55; emphasis added)

Thus, as disclosed by Schena, the usage of the input device as claimed in the present application is significantly different from the one disclosed by Schena. It is respectfully submitted that Robinson also fails to disclose the limitations set forth above.

Further, there is no disclosure or suggestion within Schena and Robinson to combine with each other. Even if they were combined, such a combination still lacks the limitation set forth above. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 as amended is patentable over Schena and Robinson.

Similarly, independent claims 13 and 25 include limitations similar to those recited in claim 1. Thus, for reasons similar to those discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 13 and 25 are patentable over Schena and Robinson. Given the rest of the claims depend from one of the above independent claims, for reasons similar to those set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the rest of the claims are also patentable over Schena and Robinson.

Claims 12, 24 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schena, in view of Robinson and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,880,740 to Halliday, et al., (“Halliday”).

Claims 12, 24 and 36 depend from one of the above independent claims. It is respectfully submitted that Halliday also fails to disclose the limitations set forth above. Therefore, for reasons similar to those set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 12, 24, and 36 are also patentable over Schena and Robinson. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any shortage of fees in connection
with this response.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: May 18, 2007


Kevin G. Shao
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 45,095
Kevin_Shao@bstz.com

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300